



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

C. Discussion of the Third Complaint, that senectus privat omnibus fere voluptatibus: 39-66.

(1) 'What of it? By pleasure in this complaint men generally mean sensual pleasure. If old age removes this, blessed be the name of old age'¹³: 39-44¹⁴.

(2) The complaint is not well-founded¹⁵: old age has pleasures.

(a) of feasts, of the right sort, to be sure. Witness Duellius's case, witness my own: 44 A -46.

In 47-48 Cato turns aside to meet an objection (*occupatio* again): 'Granted that old men have pleasure in such matters, that pleasure is not so intense as it once was'. The answer is: (1) 'If that is true, there is not the same yearning for pleasure that there once was; such things are not worth enjoying': 47-48. (2) 'Granted that they are, old age has them in sufficiency'. See 48, latter part.

(b) intellectual: 49-50.

(c) of agriculture: 51-60, to interfuerunt.

It may be noted that 60, to interfuerunt, sums up the discussion, and carries the thought back to 51.

(d) those that come from the influence and respect which a man gets by virtue of his life and character: 60 A -61¹⁶.

(3) General remarks, 62-64, with summary, especially in quae sunt igitur, etc., 64.

(4) Objection forestalled (*occupatio* again). 'Some old men surely have no *voluptas*: they are so cross, so peevish, so difficult'. 'Here again the trouble is not with old age, but with old men': 65-66, to the end of Chapter XVIII¹⁶.

D. Discussion of the Fourth Complaint, that haud procul abest senectus a morte: 66-84.

(1) 'What of it? Death is not an evil': 66 A -67¹⁷.

(2) 'The complaint is not well-founded. Death is as close to young as to old: in fact, it is nearer to them than to the old. In a word, death is always near, to every one': 67 A -69¹⁸.

(3) Digression, an appeal based on 67 A -69. Cato declares that after all the thing to be desired is not the living long but the living well: 70. Compare the homily in 36.

(4) Death is natural for the old; therefore it is a good, a blessing: 71-74. 72-74 carry the thought in part to a point lying outside the discussion proper, that death comes best when it comes as nature wills. Then comes another homily (compare 36, 70): we must not crave life too earnestly nor leave it voluntarily.

(5) Unlearned men look with composure on death: why should not cultured men attain the same unconcern? 75.

(6) Old age brings satiety of life, and this in turn brings contentment and resignation (i.e. a willingness to die, so that the call of death is no hardship): 76.

(7) Death leads to immortality: 77-84.

The detailed analysis of these sections is as follows:

(a) Declaration that the soul is immortal: 77.

(b) Proofs in support of this declaration: 78-84.

(1) Pythagoras's doctrine: 78, to animos delibatos haberemus.

(2) Plato's arguments: 78 A¹⁹.

(a) The soul's capacity: cum tanta celeritas. . . mortalem;

(β) The soul's self-activity (self-motion): cumque semper agitur. . . relicurus;

(γ) The soul's indivisibility: et cum simplex. . . interire;

(δ) The soul's prenatal existence: magnoque esse argumento to end.

(3) Xenophon's arguments: 79-81.

(a) The invisibility of the soul after death is no proof that the soul is dead: it is invisible while the body lives: 79.

(β) We remember the 'dead', because their souls are now living, working on our souls, making us remember them; 80, to memoriam sui teneremus.

(γ) If the soul has life and consciousness when hampered by the body, much more does it live when freed by 'death' from the body: 80, mihi quidem numquam. . . sapientem.

(δ) There is no visible evidence that the soul dies: 80, Atque etiam. . . apparet.

(ε) Death is the twin of sleep. Hence, since in sleep the soul is most active, most alive, in 'death' the soul will be thoroughly alive: 81, to relaxaverint²⁰.

(ξ) Summary: 81, quare to end.

(4) Men do great deeds only in consequence of their belief in the immortality of the soul: 82.

(5) Immortality answers the needs of the soul: 83-84.

E. Conclusion: 85.

(1) Old age is easy enough to bear, in itself; more than that, it is delightful, because it lies so close to the true life, the life after 'death': 85, to *volo*.

(2) Even if the soul is not immortal, old age, since it is after the order of nature, cannot be an evil: 85, sin mortuus to end.

C. K.

THE DIRECT METHOD AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

I accept gladly the invitation of the Managing Editor of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY to write upon the Direct Method and its application to the teaching of the Greek and Latin Classics. As a classical scholar, indeed, I share the ignorance of the average College graduate. Yet, having had a long experience

¹³Compare note 7.
¹⁴44 should stop at insomniis. A new section, 44 A, should be marked at Sed si aliquid dandum est, etc.

¹⁵A new section, 60 A, should be marked at Ita quantum spatium. . .

¹⁶A new section, 66 A, should be marked at the beginning of Chapter XIX.

¹⁷For the form of the argument see note 7.

¹⁸A new section, 67 A, should begin at Quamquam quis. . . So section 70 should begin one line sooner, at quod cuique, etc.

¹⁹A new section, 78 A, should be marked at Demonstrabantur, etc.

²⁰Section 81 should begin one line sooner, at iam videtis.

in the application of the method, under a variety of circumstances, to Modern Languages, I shall speak with considerable confidence. For the fundamental principles of teaching are, I believe, for all languages the same.

It has been my great good fortune not to have been obliged to discover these principles for myself, but to receive them from a teacher of German who had worked them out with great care and thoroughness. My own part later was to apply them to the various conditions with which I was confronted.

This teacher was Mr. Gottlieb Heness, whose books, *Der Leitfaden*, and *Neue Leitfaden*, are still extant. Caution, however, is necessary in judging the method by such books, for from the nature of the case they are only outlines, and may easily give the impression that new words and idioms are brought in much more rapidly than is actually the case. The lessons as they stand would occupy only a small part of the time they are meant to fill, and the teacher who knows how to employ them will, without bringing in additional material, put what is provided to use in a much greater variety of forms than he finds in print. It is this continued ringing of the changes on the same material, this combination of variety with repetition, that best drills into the minds the ordinary words and idioms of a language.

Mr. Heness's class met three hours a day five days in the week, but the work was so easily progressive that it could hardly be counted as labor at all. I was myself a theological student in the first year, the most trying and difficult of the course, more trying than I had ever found any year of School, College or Law School. It included also the beginning of Hebrew. Yet the German class seemed to take away nothing at all of my ability to do my proper work, though it taught me about as much German in eight months as I had learned of Latin, with much labor, in as many years.

My later experience with the Direct Method was first in the learning of Japanese, unquestionably, I think, the most difficult language in the world. The teacher was a Japanese who knew no English, and had had no teaching experience. I gave him a lesson in English at the beginning to show him what I wanted him to do. After gaining a little vocabulary of interrogatives, of which the most important was 'What is this' and 'What is that', I was able to make him my text-book. For eight months I had no other except a little book on grammar, which I read through at the beginning, and ran through from time to time afterward to get any available light on what I was learning. Though I have an extremely bad memory for words, only partly counterbalanced by a natural feeling for idiom, I found myself, after the eight months, able, on a sudden call, to put together, in four days, a sermon in Japanese, which, corrected by my teacher, proved to be fairly intelligible. My next experience was in teaching English by the Direct Method to Japanese

students, which was followed later by training others to do this work. The method is now in partial use, though supplemented by translation work with Japanese teachers, in practically every important school of Secondary grade in Japan. It is mainly because of this that Japanese students are so much better prepared to do their work in our Colleges and Universities than our students are to do similar work in Germany or France.

The Direct Method, broadly speaking, is an attempt to apply to the learning of a foreign language the principles by which we learned our own. Distinctions are sometimes drawn between the direct, the oral and the natural method. But the method by which we learn our mother tongue is at once direct, oral and natural. It is direct, for we have no other language through which to learn it; oral, for we can neither read nor write; natural, for we learn it spontaneously and without a teacher.

But though we all learned our first language in the same way, when it comes to learning a second language we find extraordinary variety of methods of study and teaching. On the one extreme are those who teach grammar first and the language afterward, using English perhaps nine-tenths of the time. On the other are those who use no English at all, who refuse to make any distinction between learning the first language and learning a second, and teach High School and College students as if they were infants or kindergarten children.

The latter are sometimes tempted to disregard in other ways also the distinction between a child who knows no language at all and a person who has gained free mastery of his own. 'Suit the action to the word and the word to the action', for instance, is laid down as a fundamental principle even with adult beginners. I have seen lately a class of teachers who had been studying Latin for about two months with the *Lingua Latina* method, who were still rising and saying *surgo* when the teacher said *surge*, and walking across the room when they heard *ambula*, etc. It seemed as if they must have travelled miles to avoid saying 'walk'.

Choosing the ground between these two extremes must be a case of *solvitur ambulando*, though hardly in the sense just mentioned. The way by which we best reach the goal will of course be the best way. But present conditions make a test by results difficult. Little has been done in applying the Direct Method to the classical languages, and those who are attempting it tell us frankly that they are still experimenting.

We can, however, make a *prima facie* case by consideration of the nature of the end aimed at. If the aim is to learn the language, let this aim control the method. We cannot afford to put artificial difficulties in the way.

Now, learning a language means learning to think in it. Whether our particular purpose is to read, to write, to understand by hearing, or to speak it, there can be no effective result if the vehicle of thought is

still the student's own language. For students of the Classics, ability to read is naturally the chief aim. But no one can read easily, or is likely ever to read much, if he has to translate into his own language in order to understand. And if the end is direct use, surely direct use should be the aim from the beginning.

A good teacher, we are often told, will teach well by any method. The statement is misleading. A good teacher's method never bears more than a superficial resemblance to that of a poor one. And I think it will be found that in language teaching the essential difference between the two is always this, that the good teacher's method is more direct. However he brings it about, his pupils will think more Latin in a given time than the pupils of a poor teacher. And the more he makes them think in Latin, the better teacher he will be. Goodness in a teacher of languages is proportional to directness.

In judging this subject, however, we must always remember that teaching by the Direct Method is not only the application of a principle, but also an art, and a difficult one. A teacher of Latin may use no English at all in his class, and yet not be able to make the pupils think as much Latin as another who uses English constantly. For the one can give instantly in English the meaning of the Latin, while the other wastes time in using Latin which his pupils do not understand, or in trying to convey the idea by dumb show.

What, then, is the nature of the art which makes the Direct Method effective? It is, in essence, to teach what the pupil does not yet know by such use of what he already knows that *each new sentence is immediately* or at least *quickly, intelligible*. Proper progression from sentence to sentence is *the vital point*. For this the greater part of each new sentence must be matter that is already familiar, while the new part is small, and stands in such relation to the old that its meaning is easily apparent.

The beginning, of course, should be simple. Now, the simplest thing of all would seem to be single words, and for children first learning their own language this is the only possible beginning. But it is quite otherwise with those who already know their mother tongue. For them sentences will be quite as intelligible as single words, more useful, and easier to remember.

It is the sentence, rather than the single word, which is the real unit of speech. The sentence which first introduced me to the German language (before I went to Mr. Heness, whose class I entered a little late) was "Eines Tages im Lenze sass Salomo der Jüngling unter den Palmen im Garten seines Vaters in tiefen Gedanken". Rather complicated for a beginner, it would seem! But the meaning being given at once in English, it was instantly intelligible. With the meaning came also a sense of the way the sentence was put together. And the sentence, because of the interconnection of its parts, was much easier to remember and much more instructive than an equal number of separate words. I had a similar advantage in

beginning Hebrew, for my teacher began at once with the first chapter of Genesis, the meaning of which was already familiar. Macaulay is said always to have begun a new language with the Gospel of St. John: an excellent choice, for the meaning was known, the structure was simple, and there was much repetition of the same words and forms.

How easily clever people who see the reasonableness of the Direct Method may go astray in applying it is well illustrated by the work of M. Gouin, one of the numerous people who have rediscovered it for themselves¹. A Frenchman, he had gone to Germany to learn German, over which he toiled prodigiously, even, he tells us, committing the dictionary to memory. But at the end of a year he came back with a sense of failure, greatly deepened by his meeting with some young workmen who had gone to Germany when he did, and were now talking German freely among themselves. Going then to his sister's, whose little son was beginning to talk, he began to watch the child to discover how he learned French, and came to the conclusion that the principle by which the child was led on was to be found in the question that he constantly asked his uncle, 'What next'. On this principle M. Gouin worked out a method which has had considerable vogue. In Japan it was applied by a missionary in a text-book of the Japanese language. The beginning was made something like this: 'I stand up. I put out my foot. I walk. I go to the door. I put out my hand. I take hold of the knob. I turn the knob. I open the door'. The progression here, it will be seen, is not in the words, as it should be, but in the motions that accompany them. Being a clever man, M. Gouin was reasonably successful. None the less, the error was a serious one, and he would have done better work if he had not fallen into it. Miss Jane Gray Carter gives in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 7.172 some of his sentences done in Greek. But her own are much more rationally progressive.

If one were to put into a single phrase the principle of progression in learning a language, it would be *reiteration with variation*. Progress always means to keep what we have and to gain more. By variation we gain. By reiteration we keep what we already have. One who has learned by such a method realizes, as it is difficult for others to do, how thoroughly the ordinary vocabulary and idioms are ground into the mind by it.

By this method of progression, too, we remember best what we need most, for of necessity the commonest words are oftenest repeated. By the same method we get a better grasp than in any other way upon the meaning of the words. For they are not repeated over and over in the same sentence, but appear in many different sentences, and so with variety of meaning.

At the root of this last superiority of the Direct Method over the indirect lies the all-important fact for a language student that words in one language

¹See *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.59-60.

seldom, if ever, correspond closely to words in another. The great translators of the Bible give us perhaps the best illustration of this. The word 'depart' in the King James version of the New Testament, for instance, stands for twenty-one Greek words, and the preposition *eis* is translated in forty-eight different ways. The old translators, unlike the Revisers, were free from any tendency to translate a given Greek word by any one English word, and aimed to choose always the word that was most appropriate in the particular case in hand. This alone, though there are other reasons also, is sufficient to account for the inferiority of the Revisers' English to that of their predecessors.

It follows from this want of correspondence between words in different languages that one who learns one language through another is continually misled. Each foreign word is too closely identified with some English word. The advocates of 'Suit the action to the word' see this difficulty, but do not overcome it. Walking across the floor does not show that *ambulare* means navigate, sail, march, travel, as well as walk. The various meanings of words must in any case be learned by use. And they are best remembered by their connection with other words in familiar sentences. To make pupils realize more fully this fundamental fact of language, occasional practice in tracing out particular words through various meanings in a big dictionary should be helpful.

If the indirect method has disadvantages in teaching words, it has much greater in teaching idiom. Sentences must be twisted out of shape in translation to make them intelligible. The subject must be put first, the verb next, the object or predicate last. Of course, the best teachers try to avoid this. But so far as they succeed they are using the Direct Method. For the Direct Method is positive, not negative. It is teaching *from the inside*. How we are to get in is a minor question, and admits of various answers.

However that question is answered, one thing is certain; we must get in as soon and stay in as much as is practically possible. We must learn to swim in the water, not over a saw-horse on the bank.

For it is quite certain that the amount of a language that is learned will be in pretty close proportion to the quantity that passes intelligibly through the mind. And intelligibly means easily. The greater the difficulty, the less the intelligibility. The study of an unknown language is no place for the overcoming of difficulties (not to say artificial difficulties) by the student. That belongs to the deeper study of a known language. The facts must come first and the philosophy afterward. There is something doubtless in Mr. Dooley's theory of education, "It doesn't make much difference what ye teach children, so long as it's disagreeable". But elementary language study is not the place in which to apply it. Language must be learned, not invented. 'Puzzle it out yourself' has no place here. To puzzle it out means to get things

more or less wrong, to make mistakes and remember them, and to be obliged to undo what has been done. *Each new form or idiom or sentence that we learn should be made as far as possible immediately intelligible.*

Now, language is a big thing, and cannot be learned from a few specimens. That is true of all languages, even the most 'primitive'. The Rev. John Batchelor, for one, proved this in regard to the Ainu language (which has been said by travellers to have only a small vocabulary, and therefore to be incapable of expressing religious ideas), by publishing an Ainu-English dictionary of more than eleven thousand words, including several words for God. Much water must pass through the mill out of which a language is to be ground.

From this point of view the ineffectiveness of our methods of teaching the Classics is very marked. For the quantity read is absurdly small. I remember as a boy of fifteen, in my last year in a preparatory school, having neglected my Latin, and making a desperate attempt the day before examinations to make up the deficiency. Between half past four in the afternoon and half past seven the next morning I read five books of the Aeneid, and the four orations against Catiline, considerably more than half the requirements for admission to Columbia College, which I entered the same year. What must we say of methods that teach so little?

They do these things better in Germany, we are told. Certainly they teach much more Latin. But how? If the Karls gymnasium in Stuttgart, in which I had three of my own boys, is a fair sample, as I think it is, they do it by beginning at the age of ten, having fourteen hours a week of class-work in Latin for six years, and six hours, if I remember rightly, for the remaining three years. This would be something like nine thousand hours all told, between two or three times as much as is spent in four years in our High School classes on all subjects. It must be said, however, that the German method was better than ours in one respect, that in the earlier period the pupils were not obliged to do home work in Latin. They were *taught*, not turned loose to teach themselves by learning things that are not so.

Here it may be well to note one serious defect of our American schools, that they begin to teach languages after the best time for learning them is past—the years, that is to say, between ten and fourteen. Children learn easily before ten, but they also forget easily. I have known a boy of six and a half, who had grown up in the constant use of two languages, forget so completely in five months the one that he spoke most fluently that the only word he seemed to remember was that for a horse. On the other hand, at about the age of fourteen the minds of children stiffen up, so that it is much harder for them to think in a new form than it was earlier. The learning of the first foreign language is no work for the High School age.

It is a matter for encouragement that the use of the Direct Method for teaching languages ancient as well

as modern should be so widely discussed by teachers. There is, of course, nothing essentially new in the method, however many people may be ignorant of it. Latin was not so long ago the common speech of educated men. And such usage has not yet wholly ceased. Even Americans sometimes (though I fear they are few) find themselves able to converse in Latin with foreign scholars. There has also been more or less continuity in the use of spoken Latin in educational institutions. I happen to know of a theological seminary in Montreal where all the lectures were in Latin; there must be a considerable number of such institutions in other parts of the world.

There has, of course, been much more than mere discussion of this question. Serious attempts have been and are being made to reintroduce in practice the Direct Method. Dr. Myogorossy Arcade, or, as his name has been latinized, Arcadius Avellanus, has for some twenty years been attempting to introduce it in practical form, with success, unfortunately, not at all proportionate to the merits of the cause. His method for beginners, *Palaestra*, shows that he has practical sense and skill in the application of the method.

A combination of causes, however, has made much more conspicuous, and effective in arousing interest, the attempt lately made in the series of books called *Lingua Latina*, by Messrs. Rouse, Andrew, and others in England. They have had, happily, the strength that comes from numbers, from collaboration, from the prestige of the Schools with which they are connected, from abundant opportunity to test their work in practice, and from the cooperation of publishers, as well as that which comes from their own scholarship and their understanding of the nature of their task and the principles that underlie it.

Lingua Latina consists of four books, of which, unfortunately, only three are mentioned in the current advertisements of the publishers. The one omitted is *Praeceptor*, by Mr. S. O. Andrew, Headmaster of Whitgift School, Croydon. This is "A Master's Book", intended to explain to teachers how the other books, which are for the use of pupils, are to be used. Without it there will be difficulty in understanding clearly just what the method is which the authors advocate.

The book called *Primus Annus* begins the series for pupils. It consists of sixty-five *Lectiones*, in 67 pages, which are expected in most cases to require more than one hour of class-work. Forty-three pages of *Ars Grammatica*, a brief grammar in Latin, follow. Then come four pages of Latin words arranged under headings such as *Ludus*, *Domus*, *Animalia*, *Corpus*, *Exercitus*, *Tempus*, etc.

The nature of the material for the lessons will be best understood by quotations. First comes *Prima Lectio: Litterae et Pronuntiatio*—merely a title. *Secunda Lectio* comprises six lines of print as follows: *Recita, responde, surge, conside, dic, veni. Quid facis? Recito. Quid facio? Recitas. Quid facit?*

Recitat. Recitate, respondete, surgite, venite. Quid facitis? Recitamus. Quid facimus? Recitatis. Quid faciunt? Recitant.

The Preface says quite rightly that "it will be obvious" that "these first lessons" are "mere adumbrations, which leave the teacher scope for filling in".

By way of showing how the material provided is to be used, there are about two pages and a half of Introduction in *Primus Annus*, and in *Praeceptor* fourteen pages of Examples of Lessons, which furnish explanations and suggestions on twelve of the sixty-five *Lectiones*.

ASHLAND, N. H.

THEODOSIUS S. TYNG.

REVIEWS

Aegean Archaeology. An Introduction to the Archaeology of Prehistoric Greece. By H. R. Hall. With many Illustrations and a Map. London: Philip Lee Warner; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1915). Pp. xxi+270. \$3.75.

In *Aegean Archaeology* Mr. H. R. Hall, of the staff of the British Museum, undertakes a fresh summary of the recent discoveries relating to the prehistoric civilization of Crete and Greece. Mr. Hall's qualifications for this task are well known; he is thoroughly versed in the archaeology of Egypt and Babylonia and brings to his work a comprehensive view of the comparative archaeology of the Mediterranean area in the third and second millennium B. C. He is, moreover, an indefatigable traveller in Greek lands. The sites which he describes he has visited generally more than once and with the excavators themselves he is well acquainted, so that a book by him may be expected to bring the latest news from the field. This expectation is in part fulfilled. The illustrations include views of the recently excavated sites, many of them from Mr. Hall's own photographs, and a number of reproductions of the gold ornaments and stone vases from Mochlos and the recently discovered frescoes from the later palace at Tiryns. Mr. Hall achieves, moreover, a certain freshness of treatment by his orderly arrangement, according to which he does not separate the archaeology of Mycenae from that of Crete, but treats first of the excavations, whether on the mainland or on the islands, then of the pottery, the goldwork, the architecture, etc. But in spite of this orderly arrangement and the fact that the author takes account of the latest discoveries, the book will hardly supersede the earlier works of similar scope, such as Mr. and Mrs. Hawes's *Crete the Forerunner of Greece* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.166), or Mr. Burrows's *The Discoveries in Crete* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.242, 7.84), for it is marred both by inaccuracies and by hasty writing. Thus, on page 73, the red and black mottled ware, first found at Vasiliki, is assigned to the early Minoan III period, whereas it is more characteristic of the Early Minoan II period. This mistake leads to the statement that the stone vases from Mochlos are to be assigned to the same